Poultry Preparation has a broad usage among poultry raisers and is guaranteed to give satisfaction, and according to our records it has satisfied over 99% of the poultry raisers who have used it."

Further misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label statement, "Active Ingredients \* \* \* Potassium Chlorate," was false and misleading since the

article contained no potassium chlorate.

DISPOSITION: October 17, 1945. No claimant having appeared, judgment was entered ordering that the product and circulars be destroyed.

1848. Misbranding of Jaques' Inhalant Spray, Jaques' BCR, and Jaques' Worm Powder. U. S. v. 13 Bottles of Jaques' Inhalant Spray, 13 Bottles of Jaques' BCR, and 2 Cans of Jaques' Worm Powder, together with a number of circulars. Default decree of destruction. (F. D. C. No. 17126. Sample Nos. 19188-H to 19190-H, incl.)

LIBEL FILED: August 25, 1945, District of Minnesota.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about May 28, 1945, by the F. M. Jaques Co., from La Crosse, Wis.

PRODUCT: 13 1-quart bottles of Jaques' Inhalant Spray, 13 1-quart bottles of Jaques' BCR, and 2 7-ounce cans of Jaques' Worm Powder, at Rushford, Minn., together with a quantity of circulars entitled "Information for Treating

Poultry with Jaques Remedies."

Examination disclosed that the Worm Powder consisted essentially of plant material, including Kamala and tobacco, but that it did not contain nux vomica; that the Jaques' BCR consisted essentially of water, potassium dichromate, potassium chlorate, a tarry material such as beechwood creosote or guaiacol, and a small amount of volatile oils, including oil of camphor; and that the Jaques' Inhalant Spray consisted essentially of water, formaldehyde, glycerin, and volatile oils, including oil of camphor.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Jaques' Worm Powder. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the label and in the circulars were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article contained nux vomica as one of its active ingredients; and that the article would be effective in the treatment of roundworms and ascarids in poultry. The article contained no nux vomica, and it would not be effective in the treatment of roundworms and ascarids in poultry.

Jaques' BCR. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the label and in the circulars were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article, alone or in combination with Jaques' Inhalant Spray, would be effective in the treatment of respiratory diseases of poultry. The article, alone or in combination with Jaques' Inhalant Spray, would not be

effective for such purposes.

Jaques' Inhalant Spray. Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the label and in the circulars were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article would be effective in the treatment of respiratory diseases of poultry; and that it would be effective in the treatment of coughs in hogs and in the prevention of respiratory diseases of baby chicks. The article would not be effective for such purposes.

Disposition: November 2, 1945. No claimant having appeared, judgment was entered ordering that the products and circulars be destroyed.

1849. Adulteration and misbranding of Nico Sulpho Tablets. U. S. v. 178 Dozen Packages of Nico Sulpho Tablets. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 17299. Sample No. 22978–H.)

LIBEL FILED: August 27, 1945, Western District of Tennessee.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about March 30, 1945, from Winona, Minn., by the J. R. Watkins Co.

Product: 178 dozen 200-tablet packages of Nico Sulpho Tablets at Memphis, Tenn. Examination showed that the product contained 0.79 grain of nicotine sulfate per tablet, a deviation of 21 percent from the declared strength.

LABEL, IN PART: "Nico Sulpho Tablets \* \* Active Ingredient Nicotine Sulfate (1 grain per tablet)."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Adulteration, Section 501 (c), the strength of the article differed from that which it purported and was represented to possess since it did not contain 1 grain of nicotine sulfate per tablet.

Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the following label statements were misleading since the article, when used as directed, would not be effective to produce the